



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/544,281	08/03/2005	Laura Quaranta	70220	9446

26748 7590 08/19/2008
SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION, INC.
PATENT AND TRADEMARK DEPARTMENT
410 SWING ROAD
GREENSBORO, NC 27409

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1612

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/19/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/544,281

Applicant(s)

QUARANTA ET AL.

Examiner

Sabiha Qazi

Art Unit

1612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-10, 13 and 15-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-10, 13 and 15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Final Office Action

Claim 1-4, 7-10, 13, 15-20 are pending. No claim is allowed.

Summary of this Office Action dated August 17, 2008

1. Information Disclosure Statement
2. Copending Applications
3. Specification
4. 35 USC § 103(a) Obviousness RejectionS
5. Double Patenting Rejections
6. Response to Remarks
7. Conclusion
8. Communication

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See *Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc.*, 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103—1st Rejection

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(c), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Linn et. al. (US Patent 5,169,839). The reference teaches avermectin compounds which are potent anthelmintic and antiparasitic agents. See the entire document especially the abstract, compound of formula in columns 1 and 2, examples and claims.

Instant claims are obvious when in the prior art $n=0$ and R6 represents various loweralkoxylmethoxy and other alkanoyl derivatives which overlaps with the present substituents R2, R4 and R6. Present claims are obvious when $n=0$, $p=0$.

It had been held by Courts that the indiscriminate selection of "some" from among "many" is considered prima facie obvious. In re Lemin, 141 USPQ 814 (1964); National Distillers and Chem. Corp. V. Brenner, 156 USPQ 163.

The instant claimed compounds would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated to prepare compounds embraced by the genus of the above cited references with the expectation of obtaining additional beneficial compounds for the same use such as pesticides. The instant claimed compounds would have been suggested to one skilled in the art at the time of invention was made.

Instant claims are broader than the prior art and are generically taught.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested

by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within the genus. In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In absence of any criticality and/or unexpected results presently claimed invention is considered obvious.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103—2nd Rejection

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meinke et al. (US Patent 5,028,222). The reference teaches avermectin derivatives useful as potent antiparasitic agents, anthelmintic, insecticidal and acaridicidal agents. See the entire document especially abstract, formula in lines 3-15 in column 4 and lines 10-15 in column 5, definition of R6, examples and claims.

The difference is that in the present claims the substituents are attached via a carbon wherein the prior art teaches direct link with six membered ring containing a oxygen atom.

The prior art of record is drawn to structurally similar compounds, which differ, from the compounds embraced by the instant claims in that they are homologues. The skilled artisan

would have been motivated to modify the teaching of the prior art to prepare homologues because it is recognized in the art that homologues are structurally similar and would be expected to possess similar properties. *Ex parte Henze* (POBA 1948) 83 USPQ 167.

Compounds that differ only by the presence of an extra methyl group are homologues. Homologues are of such close structural similarity that the disclosure of a compound renders *prima facie* obvious its homologue.

The homologue is expected to be prepared by the same method and to have the same properties i.e. useful as pesticides. This expectation is then deemed the motivation for preparing homologues. See *In re Wood* 199 USPQ 137; *In re Hoke* 195 USPQ 148; *In re Lohr* 137 USPQ 548; *In re Magerlein* 202 USPQ 473; *In re Wiechert* 152 USPQ 249; *Ex parte Henkel* 130 USPQ 474; *In re Fauque* 121 USPQ 425; *In re Druey* 138 USPQ 39.

In absence of any criticality and/or unexpected results presently claimed invention is considered obvious.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Double Patenting Rejections

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection

Art Unit: 1612

is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13, 15-20 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of copending Application No.10/539,274. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims are generically taught and are obvious over the claimed subject matter of this application. See for example A-B in the prior art represents CH₂-CH₂, n=0, and in present claims n=0, p=0. The substituents R₂, R₄ and R₆ overlap and therefore are generically claimed. The difference is that in the present claims the substituents are attached via a carbon wherein the prior art teaches direct link with six membered ring containing an oxygen atom.

The prior art of record is drawn to structurally similar compounds, which differ, from the compounds embraced by the instant claims in that they are homologues. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the teaching of the prior art to prepare homologues

because it is recognized in the art that homologues are structurally similar and would be expected to possess similar properties. *Ex parte Henze* (POBA 1948) 83 USPQ 167.

Compounds that differ only by the presence of an extra methyl group are homologues. Homologues are of such close structural similarity that the disclosure of a compound renders prima facie obvious its homologue.

The homologue is expected to be prepared by the same method and to have the same properties i.e. useful as pesticides. This expectation is then deemed the motivation for preparing homologues. See *In re Wood* 199 USPQ 137; *In re Hoke* 195 USPQ 148; *In re Lohr* 137 USPQ 548; *In re Magerlein* 202 USPQ 473; *In re Wiechert* 152 USPQ 249; *Ex parte Henkel* 130 USPQ 474; *In re Fauque* 121 USPQ 425; *In re Druey* 138 USPQ 39.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

2. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13, 15-20 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7, 9-10 of copending Application No.10/543,643, claims 1-14 of 10/516,839, claims 1-4 and 7-8 of 10/543,637, claims 1-4, 7-9 of 10/560,390, claims 1-4, 7-8 of 10/568,715 and claims 1, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15-22 of 10/599,671. In each case claims are considered obvious when $n=0$ i.e. there is only one heteroatom attached to atom at the left side of the molecule.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims are generically taught and are obvious over the claimed subject matter of this application. See for example A-B in the prior art represents $\text{CH}_2\text{-CH}_2$, $n=0$, and in present claims $n=0$, $p=0$. The substituents R2, R4 and R6 overlap and therefore are generically

claimed. The difference is that in the present claims the substituents are attached via a carbon wherein the prior art teaches direct link with six member ring containing a oxygen atom.

The prior art of record is drawn to structurally similar compounds, which differ, from the compounds embraced by the instant claims in that they are homologues. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the teaching of the prior art to prepare homologues because it is recognized in the art that homologues are structurally similar and would be expected to possess similar properties. *Ex parte Henze* (POBA 1948) 83 USPQ 167.

Compounds that differ only by the presence of an extra methyl group are homologues. Homologues are of such close structural similarity that the disclosure of a compound renders prima facie obvious its homologue.

The homologue is expected to be prepared by the same method and to have the same properties i.e. useful as pesticides. This expectation is then deemed the motivation for preparing homologues. See *In re Wood* 199 USPQ 137; *In re Hoke* 195 USPQ 148; *In re Lohr* 137 USPQ 548; *In re Magerlein* 202 USPQ 473; *In re Wiechert* 152 USPQ 249; *Ex parte Henkel* 130 USPQ 474; *In re Fauque* 121 USPQ 425; *In re Druey* 138 USPQ 39.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Remarks

Claims are amended therefore claims 1-4, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OMURA et al.¹ is now withdrawn.

Applicants arguments are found persuasive therefore Claims 1-4, 7 and 8-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BANKS, Joseph² is withdrawn.

New rejections are being made.

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

¹ US Patent 6,605,595 B1

² WO 93/15099

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day except Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krass Frederick can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sabiha Qazi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612

